

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The applicants' attorneys appreciate the Examiner's thorough search and remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-16 and 18-19 are in the application. Claims 4, 7, 8 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 4 and 2 have been combined. Claims 3 and 7 have been combined.

Responsive to the objection set forth in paragraph 2 "furst" has been corrected to "first". Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Wojnarowski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,866,952. Claim 1 calls for "a flat thin insulation substrate having parallel top and bottom surfaces," and "a plurality of laterally displaced conductive vias extending between said top and bottom surfaces". It was set forth that Wojnarowski et al. show a substrate 10 having parallel top and bottom surfaces with a plurality of laterally displaced vias 30a extending between said surfaces. However, Wojnarowski et al. do not show or suggest vias extending between the top and bottom surfaces of the substrate. Rather, part 30a are shown in all embodiments to be disposed above the top surface of the substrate. Additionally, claim 1 provides for "a moldable conductive electrode extending over the top of said substrate and over the upper most surfaces of said die and in contact therewith, and further connected to a respective one of said vias." It has been set forth that Wojnarowski et al. show a flip chip having first and second electrodes connected to a respective via with either an insulating or conductive mold material. Having reviewed the Examiner's comments and Wojnarowski et al. the applicants' attorneys are unable to find "a moldable conductive electrode" as set forth in the Office Action. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Wojnarowski et al do not show or suggest a moldable conductive electrode as set forth in claim 1. Reconsideration of claim 1 and withdrawal of its rejection is requested. In the alternative it is requested that the moldable conductive electrode as set forth in the Office Action be clearly identified for the record.

Claim 2 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, and now calls for "at least one passive component which is beneath said insulation cap" that "has at least one dimension which is longer than its other dimensions...said at least one dimension disposed perpendicular to said first surface of said substrate". This configuration allows for a more compact arrangement of a passive element by reducing its footprint. Claim 4 was rejected under

35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Wojnarowski et al. on the grounds that Wojnarowski et al. show a passive component which has at least one dimension longer than another of its dimensions. Wojnarowski et al., however, do not show or suggest having the longest dimension of the passive component perpendicular to the top surface of the substrate. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 3 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 was rejected on the grounds that "it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose these particular dimensions". It is not clear to the applicants' attorneys which limitation in claim 7 amounts to a dimension. The term fin generally refers to a structure projecting outwardly from another body. This limitation could not possibly be read as a dimensional limitation as alleged in the Office Action. Reconsideration of claim 3 is requested. In the alternative, clarification of the basis for rejection of claim 3 is requested.

The remaining pending claims depend from claim 1, 2 or 3. These claims include other limitations which in combination with those of their respective base claims are not shown or suggested by the art of record. Reconsideration is requested.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Asst. Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on April 22, 2002:

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel H. Weiner

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

April 22, 2002

Date of Signature

Samuel H. Weiner

Registration No.: 18,510

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

SHW/KS:gl